



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,625	09/22/2000	Christopher Cressy	3000-Z	8136
7590	06/15/2005		EXAMINER	
John A. Artz Artz & Artz, PC 28333 Telegraph Road Suite 250 Southfield, MI 48034			CZEKAJ, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
			DATE MAILED: 06/15/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/667,625	CRESSY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Dave Czekaj	2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacCormack et al. (6144797), (hereinafter referred to as "MacCormack") in view of Jain et al. (5729471), (hereinafter referred to as "Jain").

Regarding claims 1 and 7, MacCormack discloses a closed circuit video surveillance system that analyzes video information. This system comprises a "plurality of video systems to include security cameras and video switchers and/or multiplexers" (MacCormack: figure 1, items 520-1, figure 6, item 636, column 18, lines 34-45, wherein the switches allow the user to change various aspects of the video sequence), "a plurality of security devices selected from intrusion detection, and producing alarm signals therefrom" (MacCormack: figures 154 and 155, wherein the motion detection and perimeter detection are the intrusion detection, column 18, lines 57-63, wherein the alarm is the alarm condition), "a plurality of digital interfaces connected to receive alarm signals and

correlating the alarm signals with the video systems and display monitors for sequentially displaying video images" (MacCormack: figure 1B, wherein the video analysis and storage are the digital interfaces, column 15, lines 53-58, wherein the interface disperses or correlates signals to the appropriate cameras, figure 2, wherein the video display is the display monitor), "a computer connected to the digital interfaces" (figures 1A and 1B, wherein the digital interface is the video analysis and storage and the computer is the master node which is connected to the digital interface through the local node), and "one or more video display monitors for automatically displaying video based on alarm signal inputs" (MacCormack: figure 2, wherein the video display is the display monitor, column 91, lines 14-20, wherein the recording is only commenced when an alarm signal is produced). This system further comprises "a plurality of motion detectors, one coupled to each camera for automatically detecting moving objects" (MacCormack: fig 1B, wherein the video analysis and storage 518 contains the algorithm for the motion detection, figure 154, wherein the motion detection parameters are set up for the corresponding cameras), "a plurality of perimeter intrusion detection devices, at least one ITD at each location being monitored" (MacCormack: figure 155, wherein the perimeter intrusion device is the perimeter violation tool), and "presenting a frame of reference wherein the frame of reference automatically flies to a pre-configured position within a user-configurable bounding limit or user-configurable minimum or maximum distance from a selected ground point optimal for viewing said security device"

(MacCormack: column 72, lines 38-53, wherein the flying is the zooming-in operation, the pre-configured viewing position is the portion of the image plane which generated the alarm. MacCormack further discloses "a plurality of user interface controls for rapidly switching between at least two of a terrain point-to-fly, a sensor point-to-fly, a user-limited hemispherical constant angle-of attack orbit, and a user-limited variable radius" (MacCormack: figure 6, wherein the interface controls are the switches which produce views shown in the subsequent figures; figure 161, wherein the user-limited variable radius is the bounding box; column 72, lines 38-53, wherein the terrain point-to-fly is zooming in on the terrain or area where the violation occurred). Further, note MacCormack column 72 line 67. There, MacCormack discloses the camera movement can be carried out as described in US-5,526,041. Glatt (5526041) discloses in column 10, lines 40-67, pacing or walking the camera around the object, between left and right limit points, or pacing less than the entire range indicating a maximum distance. Although Glatt fails to use the term user-configurable, Glatt does disclose the pacing/walking as well as other variations are programmed responses indicating user defined/configurable settings via an interface). However this apparatus lacks the display monitor for graphical display of alarm events in a geographic context as claimed. Jain teaches that the correlation of scene features can be reduced by demanding that the scene and each camera view include constant and readily identifiable markers as sort of a video "grid" (Jain: column 18, lines 5-17, figure 6, wherein the grid picture represents a geographic context).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by MacCormack and add the grid system taught by Jain in order to obtain an apparatus that makes alarm events easy to locate on a display monitor.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, MacCormack discloses "a three-dimensional (3D) visual simulation of the facility to be displayed on the computer display monitor such that the monitor displays a spatially accurate and realistic visual representation of the facility" (MacCormack: figure 153, wherein the facility is the area being viewed which is in three dimensions).

Regarding claim 3, MacCormack discloses that "each said video camera and security device is represented as a 3D sensor icon, wherein the icon represents both the physical device and its coverage area at a position in 3-space corresponding to its approximate geographic location and area of coverage" (MacCormack: figures 150 and 164, wherein the flashlight icon appears to be in three dimensions and the icons are labeled with their respective security device representing the coverage area).

Regarding claim 5, MacCormack discloses "transitions the 3D eye point of the photo-realistic simulation to a lookdown angle optimal for viewing the simulation of the alarm inputs with rapid, smooth, and continuous motion that simulates flying in response to user selection and alarm inputs" (MacCormack: figure 161, wherein the viewing at an optimal angle is the ability to move the camera with the move button and the flight simulation is the effect of the zoom

button, figure 151, wherein the user selects the sensor icons to view the corresponding video sequences).

Regarding claim 6, MacCormack discloses “sending hardware or software commands to the video system in response to the user graphically selecting any of the volumetric areas in the photo-realistic visual simulation” (MacCormack: figure 154, wherein the selection box 2570 can be moved from one location to another using hardware or software commands).

Regarding claim 9, MacCormack discloses the “selected area covered by each video camera is highlighted in the photo-realistic 3D visualization on the display monitor” (MacCormack: figure 153, wherein the highlighted area is the box 2570 which can be moved and/or resized).

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacCormack et al. (6144797), (hereinafter referred to as “MacCormack”) in view of Jain et al. (5729471), (hereinafter referred to as “Jain”) in further view of Benson (5650800).

Regarding claim 4, note the examiners rejection for claim 1, and in addition, claim 4 differs from claim 1 in that claim 4 further requires altering the sensor icons. Benson teaches that brightness levels and icon types can be varied to provide more information to the user (Benson: column 8, lines 38-43, column 9, lines 22-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by MacCormack, add the grid system taught by Jain, and add the

changeable icons taught by Benson in order to obtain an apparatus that makes alarm events easy to locate and view on a display monitor.

4. Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of MacCormack et al. (6144797), (hereinafter referred to as "MacCormack").

Regarding claim 10, Paff discloses a security system apparatus through which an operator can easily control the security functions of the apparatus (Paff: column 1, lines 11-14). This apparatus comprises "a plurality of security devices" (Paff: column 6, lines 43-45, wherein the security devices are the fixed and movable cameras), "a virtual reality interface displaying 2D and 3D windows visualizing a real time model of a facility for display of alarm events" (Paff: figures 32 and 36, wherein the 2D and 3D windows are displayed to the user, the facility is the building), and "a device interface subsystem comprising a device icon library wherein the icons are selected from the library for representing the security devices" (Paff: figure 5, wherein each icon represents a different device). However, this apparatus lacks automatically flying to a pre-configured position optimal for viewing the security device. MacCormack teaches performing a zooming-in operation upon detecting a perimeter violation on a live video feed so that the portion of the image plane corresponding to the designated perimeter is magnified. MacCormack then states that in this way a larger portion of the image plane is devoted to what is likely to be the most important information in the image stream. The examiner notes that zooming from the

Art Unit: 2613

broad view to the zoomed-in view of the image would simulate an "automatic fly mode" to a pre-configured viewing position, wherein the pre-configured viewing position is the portion of the image plane which generated the alarm. For a further explanation on the user-configurable bounding limits and different interface modes, note the examiners arguments in the rejection for claim 1. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Paff and add the automatic "flying in" taught by MacCormack in order to obtain an apparatus that automatically displays the most important information pertaining to the alarm.

Regarding claim 11, Paff discloses "customizable audio associated with the icons" (Paff: column 9, lines 65-67, wherein the customizable audio is the selection of bells or sirens).

Regarding claim 12, Paff discloses "the security devices comprises a motion detector" (Paff: column 9, lines 34-36).

Regarding claim 13, Paff discloses "the security device comprises intrusion detection" (Paff: column 9, line 34-36, wherein the intrusion detection device is the motion detector).

Regarding claim 14, Paff discloses "a plurality of digital interfaces connected to receive alarm signals from the security devices and sequentially displaying the video images" (Paff: figure 28, wherein the plurality of digital interfaces are the monitors, column 15, lines 27-31, wherein the video corresponding to the alarm is displayed on the monitor).

Regarding claim 15, Paff discloses "a computer connected to the digital interface including a pointing device" (Paff: wherein the computer is shown in figure 2).

***Conclusion***

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2613

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DJC

  
YULE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER